

MCGILL DAILY

DEPOT LEGAL BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE

POSTAGE PAID IN CASH AT 3RD CLASS POSTAGE RATE PERMIT NO. 11024
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED AT 3480 McTAVISH, MONTREAL.

Daily petition drive begins

A group of over seventy students are now working on campus to mobilize opinion against Council's decision to appoint Timothy Denton as next year's Daily editor. "Independent Students for a Free Daily" was formed by the students who attended a meeting immediately after Wednesday's Council action and resolved to support the candidacy of Nesar Ahmad, the Daily staff's unanimous choice for editor. Another organisational meeting was held yesterday morning at 10 am in the Daily offices.

The group is now circulating a petition on campus, which states in part that "we, the undersigned students, stand for freedom of the press and journalistic integ-

rity, which can only be guaranteed by a free and autonomous Daily. We consider the actions of Council as a deliberate attempt to restrict and control the open publication of the Daily on the basis of staff democracy."

The petition condemns

- the imposition of another candidate over the Daily's own unanimous choice.

- the secret ballot procedure used to take the final vote for editor.

- the 14-point contract that Students' Society president Gabor Zinner devised for next year's editor.

It calls for "an open ballot revote by the Students' Council

continued on page 3



MARIO DIPAOLO, Arts Representative on Student Council, attempts to answer criticisms from the members of the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society executive. DiPaolo was asked to account for his support of Council's so-called contract and the use of secret ballot in the editorship choice.

ASUS supports open vote

The Arts and Science Undergraduate Society has unanimously demanded the resignations of Student Society President Gabor Zinner, Vice-President David Rovins, and Arts Representative Mario DiPaolo.

The ASUS called for the resignations last night in a motion that condemned "the use of bureaucratic measures to stifle debate," and reiterated support for the principle of Daily staff autonomy.

It also declared support for "the actions and aims of the committee known as the 'Independent Students for a Free Daily', "and promised financial support for the group.

The motion further called for the holding of an open vote by the Students' Council in order to ratify the staff choice for editor.

The ASUS also announced its intention to publish a paper every day for the next three weeks if necessary to oppose the Council rejection of Nesar Ahmad, the Daily staff's choice for editor. The paper will be run by the present staff of the Daily and all others willing to work on it. Money for the paper will come from the Free Press budget, and

an advertising manager will be appointed.

Also at the meeting, David Weiner, Internal Vice-President-elect, revealed that he had "happened upon" a secret meeting between Zinner and councillor Robert Lantos more than a week ago.

"Just to show how the meeting was cleverly manoeuvred by Lantos and Zinner, the two of them were examining Robert's Rules of Order especially the chapter on secret balloting," said Weiner. "They knew that a secret ballot allows the chairman (Zinner) to vote, and they also knew that a secret ballot cannot be discussed."

DiPaolo, present at the meeting to answer the charges made against him by the ASJS, stated that he had been approached by Zinner the day before the Council meeting on the possibility of a secret ballot. He told Zinner that he supported the idea.

DiPaolo justified his support of the secret proceedings by saying that he did not want it for himself, "but for those members of Council who might have wanted to vote for a candidate, but would have felt intimidated

by the audience, for example the Physical and Occupational Therapy or Nursing reps."

Someone commented sarcastically, "Little girls have to be protected, don't they?"

Arts rep Nigel Gibson accused DiPaolo of being "Zinner's right-hand man in railroading this decision through Council." Bill Worrell of the ASUS Council said that DiPaolo was guilty of taking an unprincipled stand on the issue.

DiPaolo attempted to give the history of the use of the secret ballot, but was interrupted by Bill Sloan, who said that "secret ballots in private voting and in legislative bodies are two different things."

ASUS President Gary Ticoll noted that according to Robert's Rules, "secret ballots are never used in legislative bodies, which the Council assumes itself to be."

The people at the meeting voiced their opposition to the use of bureaucratic rules to manipulate proceedings that they felt took place at the Student Council meeting.

Bruce Katz, Arts rep on Council, then proposed that an open meeting of the Students' Society be held on the question of the editorship.

Several other members disputed the rationale behind a meeting "with Zinner in the chair using Robert's Rules."

They stressed the importance of breaking away from the bureaucratic form of running meetings in the Students' Society.

After a prolonged discussion on possible tactics, the ASUS decided that the best course of action was to lend its total support to the ISFD and the Daily staff.

DAILY STAFF MEETING

Urgent staff meeting today at 4 pm.

INDEPENDENT STUDENTS FOR A FREE DAILY

Independent Students for a Free Daily are a group of students working to mobilize support on campus for the candidacy of Nesar Ahmad and the principle of a free and open Daily. A meeting of all members and any others wishing to work towards these ends will be held today at 1 pm in Union 123-124.



daily photos by harold rosenberg

STUDENTS' SOCIETY PRESIDENT GABOR ZINNER holding out the ballot box used in the vote for Daily editor at Wednesday's Council meeting.

WHAT AN OPEN DAILY MEANS

After one afternoon of circulation, the petition prepared by the Independent Students for a Free Daily carries 550 signatures. The support for the petition has been enthusiastic and serious, following fairly widespread discussions among students concerning the Daily's demand for autonomy and opposition to Council's imposition of a "contract" with the Daily editor. The Daily has also strongly criticized the procedures at last Wednesday's Council meeting which ended with a secret ballot vote for the Daily editorship.

Nesar Ahmad, the staff's unanimous choice for the position, came out Wednesday with a firm promise of openness in the pages of next year's DAILY. But the policy and Ahmad's defense of it were obscured by questions from certain councillors who attempted to cast Ahmad's statements in the mold of their own preconceptions of next year's paper.

Obfuscations of the sort concocted by these councillors are apt to mislead people who have as yet been unable to get at all the facts of Wednesday's meeting. Justifiable confusions have arisen as to just how the Daily's policy of openness is to be effected and as to the ideas behind the principle of staff autonomy. The second question, that concerning autonomy, is straightforward. The Daily is unwilling to give up final say on its articles, and refuses to give Council the right of interpreting the criteria of objectivity, since Daily criticism of Council may make those criteria unduly narrow and arbitrary.

With Council's avowed interest in maintaining journalistic excellence and competence as the requirements of work done for the Daily, it is noteworthy that its very first decision on behalf of the newspaper has been to appoint a person who admits to having only scant journalistic experience and who was asked to apply for the position by members of Council in the first place. There is no question that Council's editor promises to get along very well with Council. If one has a standing expenditure of some \$34,000 a year, one tries to cut corners. Mr. Denton is a veritable bargain.

In the face of a healthy increase in stu-

dent concern about the Daily and lately an increase in support for the newspaper, students have posed important questions concerning its future. For example, it is unclear to some students just what role they themselves have in determining the policy of the paper. A consequence of insinuations made lately by Council concerning the Daily has been to leave some students with the impression that the staff's right to self-determination excludes student influence on the paper's content. This is a mistake. A policy of openness for next year's Daily will encourage not only contending views within the pages of the paper, but also serious discussions with the staff on those views. This is the difference between merely allowing differing views and promoting elaboration and the critical evaluation of ideas. A conscious attempt at maintaining vigorous discussion with students works against the isolation of a newspaper from its readers.

Starting next week, and until the Daily has won an open vote on the editorship and the ratification of Nesar Ahmad as editor, the new Daily can begin to be developed concretely. With the financial support of the ASUS, the Daily can continue to publish, not with a view to devoting material exclusively to its demands, but with the goal of putting into effect immediately a tangible policy of openness.

Work to change the Daily can begin right now, with the support and participation of students. Through plain journalistic practice, students can begin to determine, with the students already on the staff, just how the Daily ought to change.

It is through struggle on the basis of ideas, ideas in black and white in the Daily's pages, that we can investigate the ways in which information is presented, and the purposes this information should serve.

This means that the Daily, for as long as it publishes this year, will actively solicit contributions from all students, especially views on the nature of the Daily, and on its role and responsibilities.

On the basis of a collective working though of these questions, the Daily can ensure that openness no longer be an abstraction, and that autonomy mean the opposite of isolation.

Tom Sorell
Nigel Gibson
Bruce Campbell
Andrew Phillips

BALLOTING AND BUREAUCRATS

Most people at McGill are by now aware of the events of Wednesday's Council meeting. There had been public premonitions in the last few issues of the regular Daily that the results of that meeting would be unhappy ones for the staff. Attempts were made at that time to meet with students and discuss the problems that had confronted the paper as well as the mistakes it made during the year. The discussions at the time were vigorous, but it was plain that they ought to have been held earlier on in the year and more than once. All that is water under the bridge.

The same thing applies in one sense to Wednesday's Council meeting. At this point, there is not much to be gained from a reiteration of the details of the questioning or the histrionics of a few of the councillors. All of these things were more or less predictable. There is something to be learned from a year of Students' Society chaos and the supposed "alternative" to it. Toward the beginning of the year we had bungling bureaucracy; now we are presented with slick bureaucracy with a pretty face. We do not have openness. This a fact which is perfectly plain to students; but repetition of facts does not make facts more plain.

However, it is important above all to point out that the design of Wednesday's Council meeting was fundamentally new. For the first time the pretense at openness and due process was quietly set aside.

Instead of the standard allusions to rules ALLOWING decision-making, two councillors showed how obscure rules make decisions a foregone conclusion.

Gabor Zinner and Robert Lantos are these two councillors. They contrived two actions taken by the rest of Council. The first, that concerning the contract between the Students' Society and the editor of the Daily — has been gone into sufficiently. But the second, the secret ballot, has behind it a story of its own.

For a start, it is now a fact that the secret ballot was planned. Mario di Paolo has admitted that he was approached before the Council meeting by Zinner for support of a secret ballot. The secret ballot would allow Zinner to vote. An open ballot would not. Incoming Internal Vice-president David Weiner says he stumbled into a meeting, and it was at this earlier time that the two decided to employ the tactic. At the Council meeting itself, it was made to seem as if the secret ballot was spontaneous. The boisterous activity of the audience was trotted out as a justification for the ballot. The rationale was that councillors would not be intimidated by students into making the wrong decision. But a ballot box had been brought to the meeting from the start. The decision was not spontaneous.

Council's action forces us to recognize two facts: first, that Council considers it legitimate to hide its stand on probably the most crucial decision it has so far made this year. Second, it was just accepted without any sustained protest that student influence on a vote is something to be shunned. Doubtless this allows some Council members to speak authoritatively on the notion of objectivity. It also points out vigorously the very weak claims that Council can make to being representative. Some councillors may be disowned by students for their actions on Wednesday. But some councillors just can't be disowned. Some councillors were never elected in the first place. Robert Lantos was acclaimed to his seat on Council. Bennet Little parks his butt on a Council chair by virtue of twenty-one votes from Commerce students. Nesar Ahmad was elected editor of the Daily by twice that number of Daily staffers.

Should it then be very surprising that students should take seriously the idea of throwing out some of their "representatives"? Let's be perfectly fair, though. When we decide to unseat our unrepresentatives, let's do it by open vote.

Radio McGill holds open meeting

Members and supporters of the Daily staff, presently engaged in a fight with Council to uphold the principles of staff democracy and an open paper, held a public meeting in the Union cafeteria yesterday afternoon.

Among those speaking at the meeting, which was carried live across the campus by Radio McGill, were External Vice-President elect David Weiner, Nesar Ahmad, the Daily staff's choice for editor, and Arts representative Nigel Gibson. Timothy Denton, Council's choice for Daily editor, made a brief appearance but refused to participate in the discussion or answer any question directed to him by students seated at different tables in the vicinity.

After Arts representative Nigel

Gibson had introduced the discussion with a brief rundown on what had happened at last Wednesday night's Council meeting. External Vice-President Whitney Hardy outlined her objections to the way certain councillors had handled themselves during the debate on the Daily editorship.

Hardy said she was disturbed at the way Council had passed the Daily contract, prepared by President Gabor Zinner, and designed to provide Students' Council with ultimate control over the content of material printed in the paper, was passed so easily, and after so little discussion.

Hardy also questioned the criteria used by councillors in refusing to ratify the choice

of the Daily staff. "I think that they voted against Ahmad rather than for Denton because of their objections to this year's Daily and that's not the question at all," she said.

"I think that councillors should have considered the wide degree of support enjoyed by Nesar Ahmad among many diverse campus organizations and national clubs, and voted representatively to ratify his appointment," added Hardy. Internal Vice-President elect David Weiner also had harsh words for "the bureaucratic techniques of Council play-babies," who he claimed had appointed "a man with a mandate to glorify the policies of the present executive."

At this point Timothy Denton appeared on the scene and was

invited to step up to the microphones and participate in the discussion. Denton stepped forward, but limited himself however to a brief attack on the students that had attended the Council meeting and supported Ahmad there.

The Council choice for editor began his brief talk by welcoming those present "back to campus follies."

"It's this sort of thing that turned Council off," said Denton, before going on to attack Ahmad's supporters at the Council meeting as "an unruly mob of children."

Mr. Ahmad, he conceded, "was a very rational and capable guy" who had presented "a very good case," but "the behaviour of his supporters turned Council

against him."

When Denton had finished, Arts representative Nigel Gibson pointed out that the most disruptive members in the audience at the Council meeting were "Mr. Denton's own supporters, several of whom were dead drunk, and kept smashing beer bottles at the back of the room."

Denton however, did not respond to this remark. Instead he rose and calmly walked away.

After another discussion many of those present expressed their support for the actions of the Independent Students for a Free Daily, a committee created to fight for an open and autonomous Daily, and for the petition now circulating to enlist student support for their cause.

More of Wednesday's discussion

Statements made by the two candidates for Daily editor, by several student councillors, and by a number of students in the audience at last Wednesday night's Students' Council meeting shed more light on the current Council-Daily dispute.

Tim Denton, elected Wednesday as editor, told Council that the single most revolutionary thing a newspaper could do at McGill would be to restore a sense of community to the campus.

"The process of dissolution of the McGill community is being perpetrated by people with an interest in destroying this community," he charged.

"The role of the Daily editor next year will be to restore some kind of feeling of belonging to this place," said the choice of Council.

He pledged to "reconstitute the community and restore it to its former vigour."

"Only then," he added, "can we begin to oppose the Quebec government's attempt to turn McGill into a technological high school."

"We are concerned here, you see, because student politics is dying or dead. Politics in my vocabulary is not a dirty word. It's simply people talking with a view towards persuasion. Politics is not a ritual struggle by which enemies of the people are exposed."

"The whole basis of politics gets attacked when people think

they have a firm grasp of the truth. To hell with the rest of the world. They are using words as weapons."

"The Daily's attempt to raise issues has been nothing else but the raising of a knife to people's throats," Denton charged.

Nesar Ahmad, the Daily staff's choice for editor, also spoke at last night's Council meeting.

"The strength of my candidacy," he said, is based upon the unanimous support of the Daily staff, not of seven people as Denton so distortingly pointed out, but of 43 people."

He restated the statement he had made both to the Council and in the Daily, that "next year the Daily will pursue an open editorial policy, while at the same time taking a definite political stand."

Ahmad questioned Denton's idea on how to inject new life and ideas into the paper. "How would you inject new blood? By killing the organism? By what moral authority are you going to kick out 45-50 people who have given

so much?"

Ahmad emphasized that "staff autonomy and freedom of the press are very important to me."

"If Mr Denton was so eager to change the Daily this year, why didn't he didn't he come and join the staff?" he added.

After the two candidates finished their policy statements, a lengthy question and answer period followed.

Nigel Gibson, Arts representative, felt that Denton "was just replacing one group of people with another" and saw Ahmad's policy of extensive recruitment next year as the "only practical solution". Denton replied that he would welcome every member of the Daily staff on his paper.

Bennett Little discounted the importance of "the unanimous decision of the so-called staff" and accused Ahmad of leading "them down the path of insurrection and political bigotry".

On the issue of staff democracy, Denton stated that "the more

you work, the more authority you have." "But," he added, "I'm the one who gets fired."

In response to a question concerning "some kind of clique" running the Daily, Ahmad pointed out that any clique can be easily destroyed by bringing in new recruits and having the widest possible participation. He added that his support comes from a broader area than just the Daily staff, presenting statements from 12 faculty members, ISA, ASUS and several national clubs.

Whitney Hardy proposed that Council open the floor to discussion from students, and though her proposal met with loud cheers from the audience, Council went on with its interrogation.

Robert Lantos then proceeded to quote at length from the Daily Stylebook. Ahmad informed him that the Stylebook had been scrapped at the beginning of the year and that personally he disagreed with the quotes cited anyway.

Gibson at this point noted that "the position of the can-

didates is very clear and it is time to discuss the issue of competence."

"I believe my competence relies upon my judgement to put out a paper to reflect the students of the McGill community," said Denton.

Gibson questioned the journalistic qualifications of several people mentioned as potential staff members in Denton's policy statement to Council. It was also pointed out that at least 30 Daily staffers would be returning next year and not 8 as Denton had claimed in his statement.

David Rovins complained of not being allowed to write for the Daily in past years, but was assured by both candidates that political differences would not affect their treatment of reporters.

External Vice-President Whitney Hardy again proposed that the meeting be thrown open to students in the audience for an allotted time period.

Bennet Little, Management rep, opposed this proposal. "It would appear to me that everyone had a chance to voice their opinions," he said. "I really don't think that anyone can shed any further light on this point."

Robert Lantos also expressed doubts about opening the meeting to the students. "Do you really think that people in this room represent a cross-section of McGill students?" he asked.

The motion to open the meeting, however, was passed.

The first student to speak was Michael Montgomery, President of the Debating Union, who noted that "the Daily has been recognized as the best Canadian university paper in both layout and content" and praised the Daily for "proving itself able to respond to student demands".

Will Hoffmann, University Affairs Director, said that "the Daily has covered our campus affairs thoroughly and quite competently." Another supporter of the Daily, Robert Blohm, criticized Denton for his irresponsible actions at a student rally held to oppose Senate interference in student elections, and pointed out that the Daily had been instrumental in mobilizing student support around that issue.

Gary Ticoll, outgoing president of the ASUS read a statement signed by virtually every member of the new ASUS executive but one. He stated that ASUS, as McGill's largest undergraduate society, fully supports Ahmad as "the only principled choice the Students' Society can make".

POPULAR STUDENT FRONT MEETING

There will be an open meeting at 5 pm today to discuss:

- Further action on Council's decision against the McGill Daily,
- National Petition for a People's Quebec, and the "French Language" demonstration on Saturday.

The place will be posted on the door of the Daily Office.

Petition...

continued from page 1

to ratify the Daily staff's decision."

Yesterday the petition was available only at a table in the Union lobby from 3 to 7:30 pm. Over 550 students signed it within that time.

Joanne den Hertou, a member of the group's Coordinating Committee, yesterday said that "ninety percent of the people approaching the table were very much in favor of the proposal. Very few people were ignorant or unaware of the things that happened at last night's meeting."

Today the petition will be available at tables in the Union, the libraries, the Leacock, McIntyre, and Engineering buildings, several of the residences, and in classrooms. Independent Students for a Free Daily are also distributing a pamphlet outlining their position and that of the Daily staff in their struggle against Council.

TODAY COLUMN

As the Daily will (unexpectedly) be continuing publication at least into next week, the Today column has been reopened. Items for both Today and What's What will be accepted immediately for appearance in Monday's and any subsequent issues.



daily photo by jean-michel joffe

A PETITION FOR A FREE DAILY is being circulated on campus by the Independent Students for a Free Daily. Yesterday the petition was signed by over 550 people in less than five hours; today it will be circulating all over campus.

Statements of support for the McGill Daily

NOTE

The Students' Council met, and finally decided. It will attempt to impose stringent controls on next year's McGill Daily. As Tim Denton, Council's favourite, put it, "he who pays the piper calls the tune". Some Councillors believe that a publisher can dictate the content of his publication. If this is the case, then we are in a very dangerous position. A newspaper belongs in the public domain and should not be a private soap-box. The publisher has no right to modify the paper to suit his needs and desires. It is his responsibility to provide a forum for unfettered journalism. If he doesn't want a newspaper, he should say so and call it an organ, and not hedge by calling it a democratic paper.

The abuse of the relationship between a publisher and his publication is the crux of the problem in selecting the editor of the McGill Daily for 1972-73. The Daily staff of 43 individuals met freely and decided democratically that they wanted Nesar Ahmad to be next year's editor. Ahmad stated that the principles of staff democracy and staff autonomy are essential to a free Daily. Essential to these beliefs is the function of continuing self-criticism of policy. The Daily must be open to all conflicting opinions. Tim Denton's claim to the editorship of the Daily is based on the sponsorship of Gabor Zinner and Robert Lantos. These two have parachuted an unqualified hack into the editorship in the name of campus unity. This call for campus unity is a smokescreen. What they really want, as evidenced by their actions, is a monolithic Students' Society that will not hold them responsible for their actions. Tim Denton is willing to dance to the tune that Zinner and Lantos call. He maintains simply that since the editor is responsible, "he" will make the decisions. How can Denton have both a clique and staff democracy and autonomy? How can conflicting opinions exist?

If Zinner is sincere about student participation in the Students' Society, then the Daily editor cannot be selected by an unrepresentative clique through a secret ballot. The students must choose. Staff democracy and journalistic freedom are the issues.

Michael Higgs
Robert Spence

STATEMENT FROM THE POPULAR STUDENT FRONT

The Students' Council meeting held on Wednesday (March 15, 1972) was another disgusting example of how Council uses its bureaucracy in order to stifle criticism from students. This time the Council wanted absolute control over the Daily's contents and passed a contract ensuring this control. Nesar Ahmad, the unanimous choice of the entire Daily staff was rejected for the same reason. Arbitrary, high-handed and bureaucratic procedures were once again used in order to push these two decisions.

An audience of about 150 students attended the Council meeting, the overwhelming majority of whom denounced Council's tactics and decisions. The Popular Student Front was formed to combat Student Council bureaucracy and the interests it serves. In keeping with this policy we condemn this arbitrary action of Council. We oppose all attempts by Council to suppress the openness of the Daily. We demand the ratification of Nesar Ahmad as the rightful editor of next year's Daily and the repeal of Council's imposition of the contract.

STATEMENT FROM WHITNEY HARDY, EXTERNAL VICE- PRESIDENT

The election by the Student Council of next year's editor of the DAILY has raised certain issues of great importance to the student body of this university:

- Firstly, the affirmation by Council of its "rights" to choose rather than ratify the editor.

- The imposition of a contract that severely restricts the autonomy of the paper in several instances.

- The unusual use of a secret ballot.

- And finally, the apparent criteria employed by council members in deciding their vote.

As a member of Council, I would like to express my strong objections to the proceedings of Wednesday night, and state my opposition to the stand taken by Council. Concerning the choice of editor, I find Council's interpretation of the Constitution to be archaic, as is the document itself - taking refuge behind past policy rather than trying to examine the principles under question is a stagnant position at best.

The secret ballot was "justified" as being democratic - I question how democratic this was in view of the opinions of nearly two hundred other students present.

In the voting itself, the debate revolved primarily around criticisms of the past DAILY rather than objective consideration of the candidates themselves. Qualifications were superseded by

condemnations. In post-election discussions, I could only interpret some councillors' positions as being not a vote FOR either candidate, but a PROTEST AGAINST the policies of the paper last year. This was definitely not the purpose of our voting on Wednesday night, and I feel the entire procedure was unacceptable and unjust. I support a total re-evaluation by the students of this university as to what they feel about the issues raised. I am not satisfied with the way in which the Council meeting resolved these questions.

Whitney Hardy
External Vice-President

STATEMENT FROM THE MCGILL STUDENT HANDBOOK

The undersigned members of the staff of the 1972-1973 Student Handbook support the principle of staff democracy and the candidacy of Nesar Ahmad for Editor of the McGill Daily. We deplore the imposition of any "contract" that binds any publication to adhere to the views of any outside body separate from the staff. We strongly endorse the resolution to annul the appointment of Timothy Denton as Editor. To achieve this, we urge the Executive and Council of the Students' Society to reconsider, revote, and appoint Nesar Ahmad as Editor of the Daily.

Ben Spector
Bruce Campbell
Joel Ruimy
Bill Fraser

Acknowledging that the purpose of the McGill Daily is not to be a representative of student attitudes, but to present facts and opinions of individuals, I support the principle of staff democracy.

Therefore, on principle, I will support any choice of the majority of the Daily staff for editor.

R. J. Mison
Student Handbook staffer

STATEMENT FROM THE MCGILL SKYDIVING CLUB

Regardless of latest events, the McGill Skydiving Club supports the freedom of Daily staffers to determine the newspaper's editor, and therefore endorses their choice, Nesar Ahmad, for editor.

Kathleen Fox
Diana Lion
Fran Darling
Almontas J. Kazlanskas
Barry Gaipman
E. Wong

REAFFIRMATION OF ISA POSITION

Mr. President and Council Members:

In view of last night's decision, which overruled the McGill Daily's and International Students' Association's opinions in the selection of a new editor for the Daily, we wish to reaffirm our choice of Nesar Ahmad as Editor, and to express our extreme dissatisfaction and disappointment with last night's actions. We are appalled and worried that so few could mismanage the mandate given to them by the students so outrageously, and could disregard the choice of so many members of the McGill community. We urge you to seriously reconsider your choice.

Alice Adrianow
President I.S.A.
Hanusia Korwin-Lopuszanska
Vice-President I.S.A.

CONTRIBUTIONS ON DAILY CRISIS WANTED

In view of the gravity of the present conflict between the DAILY and the Students' Council, and its implications for the future of a free and open newspaper on this campus, the DAILY strongly urges all students to submit whatever comments and thoughts they might have on this issue, whether agreeing or disagreeing with the DAILY's own position. Every effort will be made to publish as large and as representative a number of such contributions as is possible. Students are asked to address themselves directly to the immediate issue at hand.

Metapolitical formulations invented?

Sir,

I wish to register my whole-hearted support of the Daily staffers' resistance to the autocratic trip that is being laid on them by a body that has either the gall or the mad self-delusion to call itself a "Students' Council". It seems that this fact alone sums up the situation completely - not one Councillor who ignored the basic principles of journalistic autonomy and an open paper had the guts to state openly his or her support of Mr. Denton. Let alone try to defend an indefensible choice. It strikes me as an anomaly (I'm charitable) that Mr. Denton, whose great cause was an "open" paper accepted without a murmur a "Contract" that seriously jeopardizes Daily autonomy from a Students' Society he once called a "game". Moreover, for all the liberal (in the 19th century meaning) bullshit that Mr. Denton accepted at that Meeting of Minds (I'm not opposed to metaphysics, Mr. Zinner - only metapolitics as a substitute for practice), be assured that Mr. Denton in philosophical discussions with me (when we knew each other better) claims to be no liberal. It's also comforting to me (I really dislike madness in others, and I'm always glad to rule out that hypothesis - the thought that people are stark raving mad unsettles me) to note that Zinner at the meeting said that he'd be the last to believe in "objectivity" - I'm really glad that political philosophy has done something for Zinner. This I know: that neither Zinner nor Denton are liberals and that both at least have doubts about the "representative nature" of Council. This I also know: that by their actions, they do not support real democratic methods in either Council meetings (neither raised a murmur about the non-issues that were debated and the issues that were not nor about the doubtful "representatives" voting by secret ballot). So Messrs. Zinner and Denton, please tell us what new earth-shaking metapolitical formulations have been invented in the last few weeks. Or are there really no greater and lesser philosophical lights on Council? Can dentists, musicians, doctors, scientists, and capitalists, too, build metapolitical castles out of the air of smoke-filled rooms?

Kirk Stevens